Remarks

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action, dated July 1, 2004, in the above referenced pending application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the below remarks and withdrawal of the rejections.

Status of the claims

Claims 1-16 are pending and no amendments have been proposed herein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 10-15

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/00482234 to Liu et al (the '234 publication). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reason that Liu, the '234 publication, neither teaches nor suggests a heat sink having a side with a pattern that extends at least partially through a thickness of the heat sink, wherein the heat sink has a thickness no greater than 9 mm.

In particular, the '234 publication does not teach or suggest much at all about the heat sink other than that a substrate holding assembly includes at least one heat sink assembly and that such heat sink assembly *may* be positioned adjacent to the at least one OLED device on the substrate. The reference goes further and teaches that the cover holding assembly *may* further include at least one cover heat sink assembly. *See* the '234 publication at paragraph [0024].

In this regard, Applicants agree with the Examiner's conclusion in the July 2004 Office Action that the '234 publication "does not explicitly disclose the heat sink has a thickness no greater than 9mm, or 500 microns" (on page 2 of the Action), but respectfully disagree that it is either knowable or inferable from the information disclosed to use a heat sink that has a thickness of no greater than 9 mm (as required by independent Claim 1), or 500 microns (as required by dependent Claims 4 and 12), or the ratio of area:thickness of at least 500:1 as recited in Claim 9.

At best, the '234 publication teaches that each heat sink 21 is sized such that it is greater in size than the outer perimeter of the OLED 11 but smaller than the inner perimeter of the band 12. *See* the '234 publication at paragraph [0044]. There is no teaching or suggestion in the '234 publication that the array of heat sinks 21 or the plurality of fins 34 that function as heat sinks having a thickness no greater of either 9 mm, or 500 microns. There is no motivation to use a heat sink having the specifically claimed limitations without the benefit of hindsight after reviewing Applicants pending application.

Furthermore, the '234 publication does not teach or suggest a heat sink having a side with a pattern that extends at least partially through a thickness of the heat sink, wherein the heat sink has a ratio of area:thickness, as seen from a plan view, of at least 500:1 when the area and thickness are expressed in units of mm^2 and mm, respectively (as required by independent Claim 9).

With respect to the rejection of Claim 11, the heat sinks as disclosed and used in the '234 publication are not attached to the OLED array, but rather, are part of a substrate holding assembly (and optionally, a cover holding assembly). The heat sink assembly included in the '234 publication's substrate holding assembly may be positioned merely adjacent to the OELD device, not attached to the array itself as recited in pending Claim 11. *See* the '234 publication at paragraph [0024]. Furthermore, the sealing assembly after the sealing process does not include heat sinks. *See* the '234 publication FIG. 11 and at paragraph [0041].

Because the heat sinks recited in the '234 publication does not teach or suggest the elements of the invention claimed in pending Claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 10-15, the rejection fails as it does not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the above referenced rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103: Claims 6, 8 and 16

Claims 6, 8 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/00482234 to Liu et al (the '234 publication) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,800,905 to Sheridan et al (the '905 patent).

For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully suggest that the '234 publication does not teach the use of the specific heat sinks as claimed in pending Claims 6, 8 and 16. In particular, Claims 6 and 8 ultimately depend from Claim 1, which recites a heat sink having a patterned surface and a thickness no greater than 9mm. In addition, Claim 16 depends on Claim 10, which depends from Claim 9 that recites a heat sink having a ratio of area:thickness, as seen from a plan view, of at least 500:1 when the area and thickness are expressed in units of mm^2 and mm, respectively. Sheridan, the '905 patent does not make up the deficiencies of the '234 publication in that it does not teach or suggest the elements missing from the '234 publication and does not teach or suggest a heat sink having a side with a pattern that extends at least partially through a thickness of the heat sink, wherein the side with the pattern has a black surface or wherein the side with the pattern is black.

Rather, the '905 patent teaches only that "a pad including thermal insulation and heat sink areas whereby the pad can be used as a heat reflecting shield as well as a heat sink for dissipating heat at a desired location." The '905 patent at col. 2 lines 26-29. And, that the pad can include a plurality of layers and "at least one of the layers of the pad can include heat radiating means thereon. The heat radiating means can comprise a black surface on at least part of at least one side of at least one of the layers." (The '905 patent at col. 3 lines 17-20.) It further states that "to dissipate heat from the pad, the heat radiating means such as a black surface can be provided on one or more portions of the pad located away from the site which is to be shielded from the heat" and "the black surface coating can be provided [sic] which will facilitate removing the heat to the heat sink area or heat sink areas." The '905 patent at col. 3 lines 27-30 and lines 34-37. Based on the foregoing, there is no teaching or suggestion to combine the heat sink of the '234 publication with the multi-layer pad having a black surface to achieve the invention of pending Claims 6, 8 and 16. Moreover, there is no motivation to achieve the invention of the pending claims without the benefit of hindsight after reviewing the pending application.

Consequently, neither the '234 publication or the '905 patent, when read alone or together, teach or suggest the subject matter of Claims 6, 8 and 16. Thus, the above referenced rejection should be withdrawn for having failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MARY ANN CAPRIA
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT
Registration No.: 32,659
Telephone: (302) 992-3749
Facsimile: (302) 892-7949

Dated: 10/29/2004